

Claim 32 is directed to a device for fixing a part and a part support for mounting the part, by use of a photocuring adhesive, the part and the part support being joined via an intermediate member formed of a resin that is substantially transparent to light. The device comprises: (1) a light generator configured to generate light used to cure the photocuring adhesive; (2) a light guide configured to gather the generated light and illuminate the photocuring adhesive along a path *passing through the intermediate member*; and (3) a filter located along the path between the light guide and the intermediate member configured to filter a portion of the light such that *the intermediate member is able to maintain at least one of a color and a shape* while the photocuring adhesive cures.

The '791 patent is directed to method for bonding or potting substrates using photo-activatable epoxide masses using the output of a flexible optical light guide provided with a UV band pass filter. However, the '791 patent fails to disclose the use of an intermediate member in bonding substrates. Thus, it cannot disclose illuminating the photocuring adhesive along a path *passing through the intermediate member*. Even if it did disclose an intermediate member, it also does not disclose that the pass band of a light filter is set according to the material characteristics, i.e., the color and the shape, of the intermediate member. The '791 patent discloses that the pass band of the filter is typically in the range of 400 - 600 nm, which allows UV light to pass through the filter. However, the Office Action has failed to provide any evidence that such a filter would filter a portion of light such that the intermediate member is able to maintain at least one of a color and a shape while the photocuring adhesive cures. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of Claim 32 as being anticipated by the '791 patent.

Claim 33 is directed to a device for fixing a part and a part support for mounting the part by use of a photocuring adhesive, the part and the part support being joined via an

intermediate member formed of a resin that is substantially transparent light. The device comprises: (1) a light generator; (2) a filter located between the light generator and the intermediate member configured to filter a portion of the light such that the intermediate member is able to maintain at least one of a color and a shape while the photocuring adhesive cures; and (3) a blower configured to send air towards the intermediate member.

Regarding the rejection of Claim 33 as being obvious over the '791 and '147 patents, the Office Action asserts that the '791 patent discloses everything in the claims with the exception of the blower, and relies on the '147 patent to remedy the deficiency. However, as discussed above, the '791 patent also fails to disclose an intermediate member and a filter configured to filter a portion of the light such that the intermediate member is able to maintain at least one of a color and a shape while the photocuring adhesive cures, as recited in Claim 33. Moreover, the '147 patent also fails to disclose (and has not been asserted to disclose) the claimed filter. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established and that the rejection of Claim 33 be withdrawn.

Regarding the rejection of Claim 33 as being unpatentable over the '795 and '147 patents, Applicants respectfully submit that the '795 patent and the '147 patent fail to disclose the intermediate member and a filter configured to filter a portion of the light such that the intermediate member is able to maintain one of a color and a shape, as recited in Claim 33. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established and that the rejection of Claim 33 should be withdrawn. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that independent Claims 32 and 33 patentably define over the '791, '147, and '795 patents.

Consequently, in light of the above discussion, the outstanding grounds for rejection are believed to have been overcome. The application herewith is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Gregory J. Maier
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 25,599
Michael R. Casey, Ph.D.
Registration No. 40,294



22850

(703) 413-3000
Fax #: (703) 413-2220
GJM/MRC/KMB/sy

I:\atty\kmb\202198US-rec.wpd